



Remarks

It is respectfully requested that claims 4 - 7 be reconsidered for allowance in view of this Amendment and these Remarks.

Page 8, the "Assignment" is cancelled.

The drawings were objected to. Accordingly, a copy of Figs. 1, 2 and 3 is attached hereto showing proposed corrections in red. Figs. 1 and 2 are amended to show ref. number 72 as set forth on page 3. Fig. 2 is also amended to change ref. number 30 to 50 in connection with the pivot pin at the lower end of arm unit 40. Figs. 1 and 3 are amended to clarify that ref. numbers 12 and 13 are associated with the engine and frame, respectively. Upon approval of these drawing corrections, new corrected formal drawings will be submitted.

Claims 1 - 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reason. The specification recites "... a hood 10 is supported by a support mechanism 14 with respect to an engine 12 and frame 13 of an agricultural tractor (not shown). Support mechanism 14 includes a first support 16 mounted on the vehicle near a rear end of the hood 10. A second support 18 is mounted on the vehicle forward of the first support 16." Since an agricultural tractor is a vehicle, since the engine 12 and frame 13 are parts of a vehicle, and the original specification states that supports 16 and 18 are "mounted on the vehicle", it is not indefinite to recite in the claims that the supports are mounted on the vehicle.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable. However, claim 3 was deemed allowable if rewritten to overcome the 112 rejection and to include the other required limitations.

Accordingly, claims 1 - 3 have been cancelled and new claims 6 and 7 have been added to more accurately define the present invention.

New claim 6 is similar to claim 2 in independent form, but also recites "a spring link assembly coupled between the bracket and a central portion of the second arm, the spring link assembly being biased to move the second arm in a direction which raises the front end of the hood". New claim 6 is believed to be allowable because none of the cited references shows a spring link assembly biased to raise the front end of a hood, as recited in new claim 6.

New claim 7 is essentially claim 3 in independent form, and is therefore

2



be deemed to be allowable.

It is believed that new claims 6 and 7 are not indefinite for the reasons set forth above with respect to the 112 rejection.

Claims 4 and 5 should be allowed because they now depend directly from allowable new claim 6.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Joel S. Carter
Attorney for Applicant

Joel S. Carter
Reg. No. 29,368
Deere & Company
Patent Department
John Deere Road
Moline, IL 61265
(309) 765-4045
JSC

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and
Trademarks, Washington, DC 20231, on 5 June 02
Date

Deere & Company

Perry Whitmore 3 June 2002
Signature Date

Attachment: Drawings showing corrections in red

a